G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—20 12-13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1901-02
(Police)

File No. 58 of 01-02

Serial Nos. 1—4.

~~**Papers Filed.**~~ B.

Month March 02

SUBJECT.

Prayer of one Gouse Beig, Lance Duffedar of No. 407. of Bowringhet Taluk for reinstatement in Service.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
Correspondence	

Indexed,
K. Rangaswami

SECTION Police.

FILE No. 58 of 01-02.

SERIAL No.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

Jud'l DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT

Reinstatement in service on retirement on pension + gratuity, of one Lamu Beg from Gows Beg of Bowring pet who has been dismissed from service.

LAST REFERENCE

Letter No. 286 dated the 10th July 01

From the Inspector General of Police in mysore.

B.

The Petitioner Gows Beg was dismissed by the Hon'ble Superintendent of Police, Kolar District (now Bangalore District) from service with effect from 28-6-00.

The circumstances which led to this dismissal are reported to be as follows:—

On the 11th June 1900 one Gowri of Bowring pet, having an open fight with

one Kesavi and another Kul-
lambi, lost some of her
jewels, lodged a complain
in the Police Station thereat.
The petitioner who was then
the Karanavar duffedar record-
ed the complaint as one of
simple quarrel. But soon
after that Kunjamma son,
Balu, produced some of
the jewels before the Police
as having been given by
the accused Kesavi. A
mahazar was drawn up
by the said duffedar
and the accused Kesavi
was put in the Police
Lock-up. Then a second
statement quite
different from the
first was taken for
the complainant

Gowri touching the loss of the jewels, and a few hours after, the accused Kesavi was set at liberty. The enquiry held into the matter by Head Constable Guruya-narayanappa showed that the appellant, (Dufferdar Gouse Beg) after receiving some money from the accused Kesavi, hushed up the case and framed incorrect records to suit his purpose. He further failed to report the matter of arrest & release of Kesavi to the higher authorities. For all the above, he was

Upon this the petitioner presented an appeal petition to the Deputy Commissioner, Yokem, praying for his restoration to the appointment. That Officer in reply informed the petitioner that he should agree either for a prosecution being held against him or for complying with the order already passed in the matter by the Superintendent.

Next in Septr 1900 he presented to the D.C.L.

-ing him to restore to his
appointment on the
following grounds :—

1. That he has put-
in a long service of
16 years;

2 That during the
above period he did
his work satisfact-
-orily;

3. That persons inimical to him got
him removed from the
service with a view
to find employment
for one Krishnappa,
a relation of the
then Munshi, Puttu Rao,

4. That he was not
responsible for the
framing

framing of the incorrect records which were made wholly under instructions from Labdar Alli, the town Duffedar;

5. That he has to maintain a large family.

The S. G. L. perusing the above, gave the petn. the following Endorsement:—

No 1795 of 22-9-00
70

The petitioner is informed that as his appeal has been delayed for 4 months and contains an admission that the petn. acted improperly under instructions of the town Duffedar-

This can be no defence and the appeal is therefore dismissed."

The petr subsequently on 15.3.01 & 11-6-01 presented 2 petitions to the J. Gpl reiterating the circumstances already mentioned in his first petition and in reply to them, he was informed that his case could not be reopened as reasons advanced are not satisfactory. Finally on 4-11-01 petitioner submitted direct to Government

Ind. No 3640 of 12-4-01.
131

a petition representing the following circumstances:—

1. That both the Police Superintendent & the I. General have done injustice to the petitioner.

2. That the mistake which the petitioner committed under instructions from Lahore Office, the town Buffadar, was a trivial one and should not have ended with his dismissal;

That grounds connected with this case should be sent for and justice should be meted out to him by restoring

him to his appointment
or by giving him e
some gratuity or
pension.

The above petn
was returned to the
Petr as he did not
submit it through the
Head of the Department
concerned.

The I. Gpl now
forwards for orders
the very petition and
the connected records
with his letter no
3869 dt 11-2-02. here
286
-with submitted.
Submitted

Ma
24/2/02

X Endt no 8411 dt 2-12-01.
J 757

Please see Annexure
Paragraph 5 English Report dt
17-6-01, which gives full
particulars of the misconduct
of the petitioner.

27.2.02

I think the appeal
may be dismissed.
Submitted to the Division.

5/3/1902

3917

Mr. — with the
observation that
when there is a
distinct allegation
of bribery and the
finding is founded
documents the man
of the Warrant then
prosecuted

6.III.02

SECTION Police S/11

190 1

FILE NO. S. R. 31-02

No. 1418

Name of Petitioner Gouse Beg late Police Laus Daffedar No 407 of Bowringapet P.O.

Village Residing at Byatareyana

Taluk Bowringpet

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 2-11-01

Date of Receipt 4-11-01

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one.

ABSTRACT

Appeals against Endt No. 1795 dt 22-11-00, from the I. G. of Police which runs as follows:— "In reply to his petn dt September 1900, praying that he may be restored to his Daffedari, late Daffedar Gouse Beg, No. 407, Bowringpet Station, Kolar District, is informed that his appeal has been delayed for nearly 4 yrs and contains an admission that he acted improperly in instructions of town Daffedar. This can be no defence & appeal is therefore dismissed

MGCPB—28-3-01—3,000.

Petitioner has through the Inspector General of Police

1) The order of the Inspector Gl of Police is dated 22.11.00. ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ May this be transferred to Judicial Branch

22.11.01 Yes DD 23/11/1901

K.I. 30.11.01.

A Kagal returning the petn is herewith submitted

30/11/01

with an assault case, in which one Kasavi was the accused, he was dismissed by the Police Supdts Nr. 25 of 2-7-00 for not having investigated the above case properly; That on appeal to the I.G of Police, he was given the order appealed against; & That as he is not at fault, prays that he may be restored to his appointment or for the 16 years of service But in lieu him, he may be granted either proportionate Pension or gratuity.

Enc 1. order appealed against.

SRM
20/11/01

MY[illegible] GERMAN &
PETITION DEPARTMENT
GLO'D. NY 1418R
DATE 4-11-1907

1418 - 4/11

ਸੇਵਾ ਵਿਖੇ ਮਾਣਯੋਗ ਡਿਪਟੀ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰ ਸਾਹਿਬ

ਜੀ ਆਇਆਂ ਨੂੰ

ਅਸੀਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਸਵਾਗਤ ਲਈ ਇਹ ਸਮਾਗਮ ਕਰ ਰਹੇ ਹਾਂ ਜੋ ਕਿ ਸਾਡੇ ਲਈ ਬੜੇ ਮਾਣ ਵਾਲੀ ਗੱਲ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਸਾਡੇ ਸਕੂਲ ਵਿਚ ਪਹਿਲੀ ਵਾਰ ਆਏ ਹੋ ਅਸੀਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਆਉਣ ਨੂੰ ਜੀ ਆਇਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਕਹਿੰਦੇ ਹਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਸਵਾਗਤ ਲਈ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਸਾਹਮਣੇ ਕੁਝ ਪੇਸ਼ਕਾਰੀਆਂ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਦੇ ਹਾਂ ਜੋ ਕਿ ਸਾਡੇ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀਆਂ ਨੇ ਤਿਆਰ ਕੀਤੀਆਂ ਹਨ ਅਤੇ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਸਾਹਮਣੇ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਨ ਜਾ ਰਹੇ ਹਨ ਅਸੀਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਸਵਾਗਤ ਲਈ ਇਹ ਸਮਾਗਮ ਕਰ ਰਹੇ ਹਾਂ ਜੋ ਕਿ ਸਾਡੇ ਲਈ ਬੜੇ ਮਾਣ ਵਾਲੀ ਗੱਲ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਸਾਡੇ ਸਕੂਲ ਵਿਚ ਪਹਿਲੀ ਵਾਰ ਆਏ ਹੋ ਅਸੀਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਆਉਣ ਨੂੰ ਜੀ ਆਇਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਕਹਿੰਦੇ ਹਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਸਵਾਗਤ ਲਈ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਸਾਹਮਣੇ ਕੁਝ ਪੇਸ਼ਕਾਰੀਆਂ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਦੇ ਹਾਂ ਜੋ ਕਿ ਸਾਡੇ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀਆਂ ਨੇ ਤਿਆਰ ਕੀਤੀਆਂ ਹਨ ਅਤੇ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਸਾਹਮਣੇ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਨ ਜਾ ਰਹੇ ਹਨ

ਧੰਨਵਾਦ ਸਹਿਤ

ਪ੍ਰਿੰਸੀਪਲ ਸਕੂਲ ਆਫ ਐਮੀਨੈਂਸ

ਦਫ਼ਤਰ ਸੈਕਟਰੀ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਕਾਂਗਰਸ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਲੁਧਿਆਣਾ

ਨੰਬਰ 2 — 11 — 2016

ਸੇਵਾ ਵਿਖੇ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਰਾਜੇਸ਼ ਕੁਮਾਰ ਗੁਪਤਾ
ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਪ੍ਰਧਾਨ, ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਕਾਂਗਰਸ ਕਮੇਟੀ
ਲੁਧਿਆਣਾ

ਵਿਸ਼ਾ: ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਕਾਂਗਰਸ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਦੀ ਮਾਸਿਕ ਮੀਟਿੰਗ ਸੱਦਣ ਬਾਰੇ।

ਮਾਨਯੋਗ ਪ੍ਰਧਾਨ ਜੀ,

ਬੇਨਤੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਕਾਂਗਰਸ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਦੀ ਮਾਸਿਕ ਮੀਟਿੰਗ ਮਿਤੀ 15-11-2016 ਦਿਨ ਮੰਗਲਵਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਸਵੇਰੇ 11 ਵਜੇ ਕਾਂਗਰਸ ਭਵਨ, ਫਿਰੋਜ਼ਪੁਰ ਰੋਡ, ਲੁਧਿਆਣਾ ਵਿਖੇ ਸੱਦਣ ਦੀ ਕਿਰਪਾਲਤਾ ਕਰਨੀ ਜੀ। ਮੀਟਿੰਗ ਵਿੱਚ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹੇ ਦੇ ਸਾਰੇ ਬਲਾਕ ਪ੍ਰਧਾਨਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਸੀਨੀਅਰ ਆਗੂਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਹਾਜ਼ਰ ਹੋਣ ਲਈ ਸੂਚਿਤ ਕਰ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ।

ਮੀਟਿੰਗ ਵਿੱਚ ਵਿਚਾਰੇ ਜਾਣ ਵਾਲੇ ਮੁੱਖ ਏਜੰਡੇ ਇਸ ਪ੍ਰਕਾਰ ਹਨ: (1) ਆਉਣ ਵਾਲੀਆਂ ਨਗਰ ਨਿਗਮ ਚੋਣਾਂ ਦੀ ਤਿਆਰੀ ਅਤੇ ਵਾਰਡ ਵਾਰ ਜ਼ਿੰਮੇਵਾਰੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਵੰਡ, (2) ਪਿਛਲੀ ਮੀਟਿੰਗ ਦੇ ਫ਼ੈਸਲਿਆਂ ਉੱਤੇ ਅਮਲ ਦੀ ਸਮੀਖਿਆ, (3) ਨਵੇਂ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਭਰਤੀ ਮੁਹਿੰਮ ਦੀ ਪ੍ਰਗਤੀ, (4) ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਖਜ਼ਾਨਚੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਆਮਦਨ-ਖਰਚ ਦਾ ਲੇਖਾ-ਜੋਖਾ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਨਾ, (5) ਕਿਸਾਨ ਅਤੇ ਮਜ਼ਦੂਰ ਮੁੱਦਿਆਂ ਉੱਤੇ ਸਾਂਝੇ ਸੰਘਰਸ਼ ਦੀ ਰੂਪ-ਰੇਖਾ, (6) ਸੋਸ਼ਲ ਮੀਡੀਆ ਵਿੰਗ ਦੀ ਮਜ਼ਬੂਤੀ ਅਤੇ (7) ਹੋਰ ਜ਼ਰੂਰੀ ਮਾਮਲੇ ਜੋ ਪ੍ਰਧਾਨ ਜੀ ਦੀ ਆਗਿਆ ਨਾਲ ਵਿਚਾਰੇ ਜਾਣ।

ਆਪ ਜੀ ਦੀ ਹਾਜ਼ਰੀ ਅਤਿ ਜ਼ਰੂਰੀ ਹੈ ਕਿਉਂਕਿ ਕੁਝ ਅਹਿਮ ਫ਼ੈਸਲੇ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਦੀ ਮੌਜੂਦਗੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਹੀ ਲਏ ਜਾਣੇ ਹਨ। ਜੇਕਰ ਕਿਸੇ ਕਾਰਨ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਹਾਜ਼ਰ ਨਹੀਂ ਹੋ ਸਕਦੇ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਸੂਚਿਤ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਖੇਚਲ ਕਰਨੀ ਜੀ।

ਧੰਨਵਾਦ ਸਹਿਤ,

ਹਰਪ੍ਰੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਬਰਾੜ
ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਸੈਕਟਰੀ
ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਕਾਂਗਰਸ ਕਮੇਟੀ, ਲੁਧਿਆਣਾ

ನಂ. 8411 / J757. 82-12-1901.

ಹುಜೂರು ದಿವಾಣ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

SECTION Police

FILE No. 58071-02

SERIAL No.

ಇಂಪಾರಸು ಹುಕುಂ –

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

ಇದುವ 407

ನೀವು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ತೋರಿಸಿರುವ

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ

ಬತಾರೀಖು 30 ನೇ ಮೇ ಮಾಹೆ 1901 –

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order,

Secretary.

10

OFFICE
10483
1 : 1 02

1901-1902

From J 1258.

CTION Police

E No. 58 off O

R'AL No. 3

'2

To

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPTS.

Dated 10th
Despatched 11 } February 1902
Received
General No. 3869
No. 286
Enclosure No. 1 file.

Submitting for disposal the appeal petition of Cake Lana Dussadar Gowda Berij.

12/2

Rud

17/2/02

MGCPE—5-3-01-100

5 B

OFFICE OF THE

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

No. 386 9 / 286

DATED. Camp: Bowringpet 19 / 10th / 11 February 1901.

Enc. 1 file

FROM

B. N. Venkatavarada Iyengar Esqr.

~~OFFICE~~ THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

To H. E. Rangindayya Esqr: M. A., Mdl.,

~~THE~~ SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,

in the GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS

SIR,

I beg to submit the appeal petition of Gowri Beig, late Lance-Daffedar of the Bowringpete Taluk received through the Superintendent of Police of the Kolar Gold-Fields with the following facts touching his case.

2. On the 11th June 1900 one Gowri in an open fight with Kesavi and Kulasamki lost some of her jewels. She lodged a complaint in the Police Station. The appellant who was then the Kasaba Daffedar recorded the complaint as one of simple quarrel. But soon after that Gowri's pan Bala produced some of the jewels before the police, as having been given him

by the accused Kesavi. A Dharagar was taken up by the said Daffedar and the accused Kesavi was put in the Police lockup. Then a second statement quite different from the first was taken from the complainant Gowri touching the loss of the jewels, and a few hours after, the accused Kesavi was set at liberty. The enquiry held into the matter by Head Constable Suryanarayanappa showed that the appellant (Daffedar Gows Beig) after receiving some money from the accused Kesavi hushed up the case and framed incorrect records to suit his purpose.— In his explanation he admitted that under the instructions given by the town Daffedar Sabdar Alli, he first recorded the complaint of Gowri as one of mere assault or affray, and admitted also that he did not send a report of the arrests made subsequently. For all this he was dismissed and on appeal to this Office, the then Inspector General of Police gave an endorsement stating that his appeal petition contained an admission that he acted improperly under the instructions of the Town Daffedar and that as this could be no defence in his favor his appeal was rejected.—

a record of the case is herewith submitted for disposal of the appeal now made to Government.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient servant,

[illegible]

Offg: Inspector General of Police.

Enclosure 1. 8 3128 :

SECTION

FILE No. of 1900-01.

SER'AL No.

Mysore 152

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE * IN MYSORE * 5 JAN 1900

The Inspector General
has been desirous
for seeing 4
months & E.
on Tuesday and
a Sanction that
he can

No 1795

(2) Endorsement

In reply to his petition dated September 1902 praying that he may be restored to his Daffedari, late Daffedar Crown Brig, No: 407, Bowringpet Station, Kolar District, is informed that his appeal has been delayed for nearly 4 months and contains an admission that he acted improperly under instructions of town Daffadar. This can be no defence and the appeal is therefore dismissed.

FILED
SERIAL NO.

Office of the Inspector General of Police in Mysore
Dated Bangalore 22 November 1902

for Inspector General of Police

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
2 JAN. 1907
IN MYSORE

SECTION 3
FILE No.
SERIAL No.

No.
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
19 MAR. 1901
IN MYSORE

15-3-91

5640 of 12/4/01
131

SECTION
FILE No. 5
SERIAL No.

Endorsement

With reference to his petition dated 15-3-01

Praying that he may be restored to his appointment, Gous Beig late Duffedar no 40 Boorinjpet Taluq is informed that his reasons are not satisfactory and so the his case cannot be re-opened as the reasons advanced are not satisfy.

"Draft"
20/4.

SECTION G
FILE No. 460
SERIAL No.
10 JAN. 1902
IN MYSORE

18

Forwarded for
Inspector
General of Police

From
Superintendent
Devanhalli
Dated 8/11 2-12-1901

Received 28-1-1902

Enquiry
forwarded
with a
letter
detailing
the case
30/1/1902

Records
sent to the
Inspector
General of Police
Bangalore with
a letter as
per draft.
K.S. 8/2/1902

ಇಂದಿನ ಕಾಲದ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ಲಕ್ಷಣ. ಮಾನವ ತನ್ನ
ಅಸ್ತಿತ್ವಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಉಳಿವಿಗಾಗಿ ಹೋರಾಡುವುದು.
ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತದಲ್ಲಿ ಬದುಕುವ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಭವಿಷ್ಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ
ಯೋಚಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಭವಿಷ್ಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯೋಚಿಸುವ
ಮನುಷ್ಯ ವರ್ತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಬದುಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ
ಕಾರಣ ಏನು? ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುವ ಅಸಮಾನತೆ.
ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುವ ಅಸಮಾನತೆಯಿಂದ ಮನುಷ್ಯ
ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಂದ ದೂರವಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಅಸಮಾನತೆಯಿಂದ
ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಂದ ದೂರವಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಅಸಮಾನತೆಯಿಂದ
ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಂದ ದೂರವಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾನೆ.

ಇಂದಿನ ಸಮಾಜದ ಅಸಮಾನತೆಯ ಕಾರಣಗಳು
ಹಲವು ವಿಧವಾಗಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದವು
ಹೀಗಿವೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಂತ ಬಡವರ ನಡುವಿನ ಅಂತರ
ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು. ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರು ಇನ್ನಷ್ಟು ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು
ಮತ್ತು ಬಡವರು ಇನ್ನಷ್ಟು ಬಡವರಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು.
ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ — ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚು
ಹಣವನ್ನು ಗಳಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದು. ಹಣವನ್ನು ಗಳಿಸಲು
ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಸಿಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು.
ಅವಕಾಶಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಸಿಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ —
ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವಿರುವುದು. ಹಣವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ
ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಸಿಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು.
ಅವಕಾಶಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಸಿಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ
ಹಣವನ್ನು ಗಳಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದು. ಹಣವನ್ನು ಗಳಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ

4

Summarised

The case appears to be briefly this:—

Gavari, Kasmi, and Kulusambi are 3 bad women at Bowringpet. On the 11th inst,— Gavari had a customer. Gradually he got angry. Kasmi became anxious. She wanted

Either to make fun or annoy her fortune
neighbour. She Set up Lakka for the purpose
He kicked the door when the couple was inside.
Gavari used bad Language. A quarrel or
affray took place between the 3 women. During
the quarrel the jewels or trinkets which they
were either dropped down or went to the hands
of the other. The matter reached the Police. Gavari
Complained of the loss of her jewels. Kasabo
Duffedar Govt Beat recorded the Complaint
as one of quarrel in the first instance. Soon
after Gavari's Son Bala produced some of the
jewels before the Police as having been given
by Kasani, who Kasani admitted it. A
Mahazar was drawn up by the Duffedar.
Kasani was shoved into the Lockup. A Second
or a totally different Statement was taken
from Gavari touching the loss of jewels. A
few hours after, Kasani was Set at liberty.
Inspector Mr. Wright, who was then at the
Station heard that. The whole thing was
bungled up. He ordered Head Constable
Suryanarayana to enquire and ascertain
the truth (2) The Head Constable's report is

sufficiently exhaustive. I do not propose therefore to enter into details. I have also gone through the witnesses and heard Duffedar Gomo Beig. I agree with the conclusions of the Head Constable.

(3) This is a town case. It may be that for want of sufficient experience, town Duffedar Sabdarali asked Gomo Beig to help him in recording the Complaint. It may be that the work did not legitimately belong to him (Gomo Beig).

(4) The allegation against Gomo Beig is that he attempted to hush up a case and that he arrested and locked up Kasani and let her go for a consideration and that he framed incorrect records etc.

(5) The Duffedar's (Gomo Beig's) explanation comes to this:- That Sabdarali wanted him to record the complaint as one of assault or affray; that he did so, that the locked charge did not belong to him, that the woman Kasani was drunk, that he did not submit any arrest report, that no money passed hands, that there was enmity between Sabdarali and himself etc.

If Sabdarali really wanted to have it

the matter lightly or in other words to look upon the matter, is it likely and would it be be so foolish as to go to Gowo Beig and ask him to change the nature of the Complaint? Even if Sabadalli asked him to do a wrong and illegal thing, why did he consent to do a thing to it! Why did he not refuse to record the Complaint from Sabadalli and why did he not at once go to the Inspector or the Superintendent of Police and expose the Conduct of Sabadalli!

Gowo Beig's explanation is all stuff and nonsense. Having undertaken to record the Complaint and being himself a Police Officer, Gowo Beig should have recorded the Complaint faithfully and framed Correct records.

1 That Kasani was drunk &c is a bare-faced lie. Nobody supports Gowo Beig's in his assertions.

2 So far as proof can go, it is proved that Gowo Beig recorded a Coloured Statement, that he sent Kasani in knowing that he subsequently released her that Kasani was not drunk, that Gowo Beig made an inventory of the property on the person of

Kasavi, that he made incorrect records, that he failed to report the matter to his official-Superiors that his conduct is most improper and suspicious.

9. That Gowse Beig gave money to Sahadalali and that the latter refused to take it, is spoken to by writer Constable Krishnappa.

10. I am not prepared to accept the explanation of Gowse Beig. Once or twice, I warned this man to be careful and to do his duty properly. My words were simply wasted on him. He appears to be an unreliable person and unworthy member of the force. I do not wish to have such men who bring this dis-(?) credit on their official Superiors. It is a pity and it is a grave-pity that Inspector Wright did not go into the matter then and there.

Sd/. S. Narayana Rao

Amildar. 17.6.00

Order

I have gone carefully through these records and there is not the slightest doubt that acting Lance Duffedar Gowse Beig is guilty of

the acts enumerated in the 8th para of the —
Guidance hereto and I direct his dismissal
from the force.

Sd/. C. Hamdin
Supdt of Police.

Melour
28-6-1900

Copy"

Superintendent of Police.

2.7.00

Kolar Gold field

Draft

1901-2

39

(11)

FC Police

LE No. Pf 01-02

SER'AL No. 12

Read :—

Letter No 3869/286 Dated 10th Feb 02 from the I. Gl of Police in Mysore submitting for disposal a petition from late Lance Duffedar Eswa Beig, Bowringpet Taluk, appealing against his dismissal from service on allegations of mis-conduct in dealing with a case of affray between certain bowers.

Order thereon No 15014 dt 12/12/02

The appeal is dismissed. Govt however observe that when there is a distinct allegation of bribery and the framing of

incorrect document
the man ought to have
been prosecuted

Yours
for Secy
11/3/02
CCL 11/3/02

To
The S. Elof Police